

REMARKS

Applicants request respectfully that the allowability of the claims be reconsidered in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Status of the Claims

The Examiner's Action dated January 9, 2008 addressed Claims 1, 7, 11, 14, and 15. Claim 11 is canceled. Claims 33 to 38 are added. Claims 1 and 7 are amended. Accordingly, the claims pending presently for examination are Claims 1, 7, 14, 15 and 33 to 38.

Discussion of the Amendments

Claim 1 was amended by adding the recitation "to form a stable colloid for gene transfer" as is recited in the preamble.

Claim 7 was amended by deleting the recitation "polyamines comprising guanidinium groups."

Claim 11 was canceled because it improperly depended on Claim 1 which recites the DNA complex using "consists of" language.

Claim 33 was added to claim the subject matter that was deleted from Claim 7.

Claim 34 was added to claim the subject matter of previously pending Claim 11 in independent form and incorporates the recitations of Claim 1 and previously pending Claim 11. Claims 35 to 38 are patterned after Claims 7, 14, 33 and 15 but

depend from new Claim 34. No new matter has been added.

Discussion of the Indefiniteness Rejections

Claims 1, 7, 11, and 14-15 have been rejected as being indefinite for omitting the step “wherein the objective of the method set forth in the preamble is reiterated.” Action at ¶ 7. Although applicants disagree that such step is necessary, in order to put the claims in condition for allowance, the recitation, “to form a stable colloid for gene transfer” has been added to the end of Claim 1. This recitation reiterates the preamble as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 7 has been rejected as being indefinite for reciting “the broad range limitation ‘branched polyamine’ and the narrow limitation ‘polyamines comprising guanidinium groups’ in the same claim. Action at ¶ 9. Applicants have deleted the recitation “polyamines comprising guanidinium groups” from Claim 7. Applicants have added new Claim 33 which depends from Claim 7 to recite this recitation. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 has been rejected as being indefinite for reciting “the limitation ‘further consists of.’” Action at ¶ 10. Applicants have canceled Claim 11 and rewritten it in independent form as Claim 34. Claim 34 incorporates the recitations of Claim 1 and previously pending Claim 11. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 09/996,838
Attorney Docket No. P 23,643-A USA

February 20, 2008
Page 7

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants assert that the claims are in condition for allowance and request respectfully issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If there are any unresolved matters, applicants request respectfully an interview prior to the issuance of another Action.

If any additional fees are required to continue the prosecution of this application, please charge such fees to Deposit Account 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marc S. Segal/

Marc S. Segal
Registration No. 40,163

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
1101 Market Street, Suite 2600
Philadelphia, PA 19107
(215) 923-4466 - Telephone
(215) 923-2189 – Facsimile